

AMENDMENT
November 22, 2005

BLD920020007US1
Serial No. 10/065,745

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 9 remain in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1 – 6 and 9 are amended. New claims 10 and 11 are added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 10 and 11 are supported by the application as filed and, specifically, Figure 2. No reference of record teaches or suggests directly connecting the sequencer output to the raster image processor input ports as claims 10 and 11 recite. Amendments to claims 1, 5, 6 and 9 are also supported by the application as filed and, specifically, Figure 2. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 – 5 are objected to for lacking “An” before apparatus. Partially responsible thereto, claims 1 – 5 are amended herein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 – 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943 to Barry et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,390 to Fujii. Claims 2 and 6 – 9 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al. and Fujii in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,016 to Venkateswar et al. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al. and Fujii in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,460 to Hohensee et al.

In rejecting claims 1 and 3 it is asserted that Barry et al. discloses the “sequencer ([by] instruction operator for job file 114 of Fig. 1a) which has an output port which communicates with the input ports of said plurality of raster image processors (col. 4, lines 34-40)... .” Fujii et al. is relied upon to “disclose a plurality of print head drivers,”

AMENDMENT
November 22, 2005

BLD920020007US1
Serial No. 10/065,745

The Barry et al. instruction operator 114 is connected to a “distributor block 118 [that] is provided to distribute in multiple print job files, each multiple thereof having a select portion of the print job which was segmented or partitioned by instruction operator 114 for processing according to separate processes in a plurality of parallel sections of the print system illustrated in FIGS. 1a and 1b.” Col. 5, lines 8 – 14. So, while the Barry et al. instruction operator 114 may be in communication with the Barry et al. RIP engines; the instruction operator 114 is not networked with the RIP engines and certainly not connected to the RIP engine inputs. Instead, the “distributor 118 provides the print job file 104 including a first select portion 140 along a line 142 to a first RIP engine 150.” *Id.*, lines 14 – 16.

Accordingly, since amended claim 1 recites that the sequencer “has an output port networked and communicating with the input ports of said plurality of raster image processors,” the combination of Barry et al. with Fujii et al., or any other reference of record does not result in the present invention as recited in claim 1. Neither does, Barry et al. teach or suggest connecting the sequencer output port to the raster image processor input ports as recited in new claim 10. Thus, neither does the combination of Barry et al. with Fujii et al., or any other reference of record, result in the present invention as recited in claim 10.

Additionally, since Hohensee et al. fails to teach a sequencer that “has an output port networked and communicating with the input ports of said plurality of raster image processors” as amended claim 5 recites; Hohensee et al. in combination with Barry et al. and Fujii et al. does not result in the claimed invention as claimed in amended claim 5. Neither does, Hohensee et al. teach or suggest connecting the sequencer output port to the raster image processor input ports as recited in new claim 11. Thus, neither does the combination of Hohensee et al. with Barry et al. and Fujii et al., or any other reference of record, result in the present invention as recited in claim 11.

AMENDMENT
November 22, 2005

BLD920020007US1
Serial No. 10/065,745

Furthermore, since dependent claims include all of the differences with the references as the claims from which they depend, neither Barry et al. or Fujii et al. teaches or suggests the present invention as recited in claim 3. Since neither Venkateswar et al. nor Hohensee et al. adds anything that was missing from the combination of Barry et al. or Fujii et al. to result in the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 3 much less dependent claims 2 and 4, which depend therefrom; Barry et al. and Fujii et al. in further combination with Venkateswar et al. or Hohensee et al. does not result in the present invention as recited in claims 2 and 4. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Barry et al. and Fujii et al. alone, or in further combination with either Venkateswar et al. or Hohensee et al., or any reference of record, is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 6 – 9, claims 6 and 9 are amended to recite “communicating queued packaged print stream data portions directly to a plurality of raster image processors” at lines 5 – 6 and 8 – 9, respectively. This is quite different than the instruction operator 114 passing the data stream to a distributor 118 that “provides the print job file 104 including a first select portion 140 along a line 142 to a first RIP engine 150.” *Supra*. Accordingly, the combination of Barry et al. with Fujii et al. and Venkateswar et al., or with any other reference of record, does not result in the present invention as recited in claim 6 or 9. Since dependent claims include all of the differences with the references as the claims from which they depend, neither Barry et al., Fujii et al. or Venkateswar et al. teaches or suggests combining to result in the present invention as recited in claim 7 or 8. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Barry et al. and Fujii et al. in combination with Venkateswar et al., or further in combination with any other reference of record, is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the

AMENDMENT
November 22, 2005

BLD920020007US1
Serial No. 10/065,745

amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 1 – 5, consider new claims 10 and 11, reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allow the application to issue.


Should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes.

Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-3669 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,

November 22, 2005
(Date)

Customer No. 56,989
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
Suite 100
11703 Bowman Green Drive
Reston, Virginia
Telephone: (703) 481-0532
Facsimile: (703) 481-0585



Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
Registration No. 34,406